DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 529 EA 018 157

AUTHOR Watson, Pat; And Others
TITLE The School Makes a Difference: Analysis of Teacher Perceptions of Their Principal and School Climate.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Role; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Factor Analysis; *Leadership; Organizational Climate; *Principals; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Administrator Effectiveness; Oklahoma City Public Schools

ABSTRACT

Survey responses from over half of Oklahoma City's 2,500 teachers indicated their views of the effectiveness and leadership of the city's 94 school principals. The survey's 82 items were selected from ideas suggested in the principal effectiveness literature and from the leadership component of Oklahoma City's prinipal evaluation forms. The 82-item questionnaire was divided into eight categories focusing on the principals' high expectations, instructional leadership, dynamism, effective use of consultation, ability to create order, use of resources, use of time, and ability to evaluate effectively. The responses were aggregated to provide principals with feedback concerning their own faculties' attitudes as compared with the attitudes expressed toward the city's principals as a group. The reliability of the survey was indicated by the high degree of internal consistency shown among the responses by individual teachers and among the teachers in individual buildings. Factor analysis of the 78 survey items not tied to grade levels yielded eight factors accounting for over 99 percent of the variance in the item intercorrelation matrix. The first of these factors, accounting for 85 percent of the variance, had a major component related to the principal's affective skills and interpersonal relations with the staff. The survey form and the method of internal consistency assessment are appended. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Pat Watson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED266529

THE SCHOOL MAKES A DIFFERENCE: ANALYSIS OF TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

Pat Watson
John Crawford
George Kimball

Planning, Research, and Evaluation Department
Oklahoma City Public Schools

March, 1985

Prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, March, 1985

EA 018 157

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The School Makes A Difference:
Analysis of Teacher Perceptions
of Their Principal and School Climate

Introduction, Origin of the Survey Instrument

In the 1983-84 school year, a "Discipline Committee" of Oklahoma City teachers recommended the following:

> "That an annual climate survey be used to determine ways in which the day-to-day operations may be assessed and improved in each building".

The Planning, Research, and Evaluation Department was asked by the Assistant Superintendent of School Operations to conduct the survey. The committee's concerns appeared to focus on the principal's leadership style and practices, more than the "overall climate" of the school.

Specific questions dealing with the impact of this style and recommendations for modification of "ineffective leadership behavior" seemed to be relevant. A survey appropriate for local needs and that was based on recent research was not located. Therefore, an instrument was developed and administered locally. The majority of the results presented in this report are from this instrument.

Survey items were developed from two sources: (1) research literature on the effective principal, and (2) the OCPS Principal Evaluation Form.

The Effective Principal: A Brief Summary of the Research

What makes a principal "effective"? Do effective leaders in the fields of educational administration and management share common characteristics? Yukl (1981) maintains that the process of influencing, directing, and motivating subordinates is important whether the leader is a corporate head or the principal of a school.

From Yukl's overview of research on managerial leadership, several sets of variables were isolated, specifically:

1. Managerial Traits
2. Power and Influence
3. Leadership Behavior, and
4. Situational Theories of Leadership

The trait research suggests that it is possible to use systematic procedures to identify persons who are likely to be successful as principals.

Salley, et al., (1979) have advocated moving toward research on within-school and within-classroom variables instead of only examining between-school variables. According to Salley, there appears to be more variability within schools where conditions more directly affect student outcomes.

While many principals probably have an image of themselves as that of leader, instructional expert, corporate decision-maker, change agent, and manager of conflict, the research indicates that they most often view themselves as "the principal - the leader".

Historically, there is conflict in the emphasis given to instructional leadership and managerial requirements. The fact is, however, that an effective principal successfully juggles many different demands and roles.

Four studies in the 1960's provided insight into personal characteristics of principals. Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederikson (1962) compared principals with each other and focused on interactions with staff. Gross and Herrior (1965) maintained that principals should perform more than routine administrative tasks and emphasize improvement of staff performance. Foskett (1967) spoke to the diversity of the role of principal and the conflict in so-called "force fields" (teachers, students, parents, and community).

Lipham and Francke (1966) studied the principal's day-to-day job tasks and working environment and found a complex range of personal, interpersonal, and contextual factors related to differences between "promotable" and "non-promotable" principals.

More recent research has been perhaps less pragmatic, and sometimes does not tend to focus on policy issues. One strategy is to examine the actual behavior of principals. Wolcott (1973) characterizes the principal role as a series of one-to-one, personal confrontations, highly individual, and problem-centered.

Salley, McPherson, and Baehr (1979) developed a "Job Function Inventory" for school administrators and found that the principals' responses took four basic patterns:

- emphasizing group support and involvement
- focusing on academic performance of stuoents
- expending personal effort in developing staff, and
- keeping close to central office and maintaining fiscal control.

The Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) study described effective principals as having a strong commitment to children and schools. Further, those effective principals were action-oriented and were not chained to routine demands. Effective school administrators also used a variety of approaches to problem-solving.

A thread of similarity is seen among the several research studies -- effective school principals tend to have support from staff and community; and they are able to tap the resources of the school superintendent's office.

A National Institute of Education study by Cookson and Persell (1978) identified nine systematic behavior patterns that "good" principals exhibit. The factors provided several items for the OCPS principal assessment, and are listed below:

1. Demonstrating a commitment to academic goals
2. Creating a climate of high expectations
3. Functioning as an instructional leader
4. Being a forceful and dynamic leader
5. Consulting effectively with others
6. Creating order and discipline
7. Marshalling resources
8. Using time well
9. Evaluating results

An overview of the above research, as well as additional studies on effective school administrators, is presented in a publication by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Reston, Virginia: 1982) entitled The Effective Principal.

OCPS Principal Performance Evaluation Program

In addition to the effective principal research, the OCPS principal evaluation form yielded questionnaire items on leadership style. This form is used annually for principals' performance review. The district initiated the Principal Performance Evaluation Program (PPEP) as an outcome of activities by a 1980 task force. The PPEP had two cycles: An intensive cycle and a monitoring one.

The Intensive Cycle was for evaluating a new principal's first three years and for evaluating every subsequent third year. Developing goals and objectives, as well as employment of standards of performance, comprised the criteria for the intensive cycle.

The Monitoring Cycle was used for evaluating the intervening two years between intensive evaluations. The standards of performance provided for evaluator appraisal and evaluatee self-appraisal.

In 1983, another committee was charged with recommending updated job descriptions, evaluation instruments, and processes to clarify the district's expectations for (and roles for) principals and assistant principals.

Primary among this district's expectations for principals and assistant principals were: (1) responsibility and leadership in the

areas of student learning, (2) school climate and public relations, and (3) the general business administration of the school.

Evaluation instruments and processes were revised to provide for an annual evaluation which was reflective of the school administrator's job description and the goals of the local Board of Education.

The remainder of this report presents, in order: methods of data collection and analysis, results of analyses, and discussion of implications of results.

Method

Subjects

The Leadership/Climate Inventory was developed in mid-year of the 1983-84 academic year, and copies were sent to all of the (approximately 2,500) teachers in the district in March of 1984. More than half of the teachers responded, yielding 1294 usable protocols. All 94 schools in the district were represented in the data (with an average of 13.8 teacher questionnaires per school). With such a large number of teachers responding (and such a high percentage of the total population), we may be reasonably confident that the population of all OCPS teachers was adequately sampled. Although individual teachers could not be identified, respondees were asked to indicate their school. This permitted aggregation and anaylsis of school-level data. Principals were assured that individual schools would not be identified to administrators or in

any research report. Any presentation of data in this report is for groups of schools only (for example, schools grouped by grade-level).

One of the main reasons for administering the survey to teachers was to be able to give feedback to principals on how they were rated by their staff. This feedback occurred in a timely fashion during the Spring semester (and therefore pre-dated this research report). Computer printouts were translated onto a blank questionnaire to show each principal: (1) his or her own mean ratings on each item, and (2) a "comparison mean" representing the average on that item for all schools at the same grade-level as that particular principal. Anecdotal evidence suggested that principals did attend to this feedback. Such feedback could be a valuable source of information to the principal concerning the perceptions of his or her instructional staff.

Instruments

Student achievement scores were aggregated to the school level for Total Reading and Total Math. NCE (Normal Curve Equivalent) California Achievement Test scores were used. School-level means represent the between-school measure of achievement in the anaylses with the school as the unit of analysis. Two years of achievement data were analyzed: from end-of-year 1983 and end-of-year 1984. Those occasions are taken as pre-scores and post-scores for the 1983-84 academic year.

The survey of principal leadership and school climate was developed and used during the 1983-84 academic year. Teachers completed the questionnaire in March and April, 1984, and principals were given feedback in May, 1984. The questionnaire consisted of 82 items, grouped (a priori) within the following 8 subsections:

A. High Expectations
B. Instructional Leader
C. Forceful/Dynamic
D. Consulting Others Effectively
E. Creating Order/Discipline
F. Resources
G. Using Time Well
H. Evaluating Results

In the results section of this report, we give internal consistency reliability statistics (Cronbach's Alpha) for the entire instrument and for the separate subsections. Factor analyses were also performed in order to identify underlying dimensions within the 82 item questionnaire. See Appendix A for a copy of the instrument.

The surveys completed by teachers were returned to the Research Department. Likert-type responses on a 5 point scale for each item were coded for computer analysis. Items left blank or with more than one response marked were coded as missing data. Although individual teachers were not identified, school identification was needed and was asked for. Surveys without the school identified were not analyzed. There were 1,294 teacher surveys analyzed.

Since teachers were the sampling units, the first analyses used the teacher as the unit of analysis. Those between-teacher analyses were designed to assess the reliability of the survey and to further our understanding of underlying dimensions of the teachers' responses.

The form of the reliability analyses consisted of assessment of the "internal consistency" of the survey instrument. This type of reliability yields information on the extent to which items within the questionnaire "cling together", or, are consistent. It does not address (as test-retest reliability would) the stability of responses across occasions separated by some length of time. A high coefficient from the internal consistency analysis would at least indicate that teachers were not merely capriciously checking "always" on one item and "never" (or some other randomly chosen response) on the next one. It would also indicate that, despite the surface appearance of the difference among the 82 items, teachers tended to rate their principal similarly on most of the items (i.e., the items are highly correlated with each other).

The other analyses carried out with the teacher as the unit of analysis were factor analyses of the survey responses. Factor analysis is a method for extracting the essential underlying constructs from a large, multivariate data base. Although primarily a data reduction tool, factor analytic studies can tell us something about the validity of the item reponses. If the obtained factor

structure is clear and substantively meaningful, then we may proceed with analyses of factor scores and avoid the redundancy of large numbers of items which share considerable variance among themselves. Factor analyses of questionnaire data can also yield some insight into the cognitive information processing and the values or attitudes of the persons filling out the questionnaires (teachers, in this instance).

Results: Reliability and Factor Analyses With the Teacher as the Unit of Analysis

Correlational and factor analyses were carried out with the N of 1294 teacher-level data. The results of these analyses are presented in Appendix B. Analyses were of the 78 survey items (of 82) that were potentially applicable in all grade-levels.

The first results in Appendix B refer to analyses of the reliability of the survey instrument. The assessment of reliability was by internal consistency methods, using Cronbach's alpha. A high internal consistency coefficient indicates that items are highly interrelated. The results tell us something about how the teachers viewed the items on the survey. If items are not highly internally consistent, then we infer that the teachers responded one way to one item (e.g., "usually" or "always") and quite inconsistently to other, perhaps related, items (e.g., "seldom" or "never").

Results showed the instrument to be highly internally consistent. That is, despite the apparent differences in content of the many survey items, the teacher responses imposed a great regularity or consistency on the items by using ratings that generally agree across items. This may say as much about teacher perceptions of their principals as it does about reliability of the instrument. Given any randomly selected subset of the 78 items, the odds are good that if the ratings on some of the subset of items are high, then ratings on the others will likely be high (and, conversely, for relatively low ratings on some, expect low ratings on others).

The internal consistency findings are also presented for the a priori subscales within the questionnaire. Even though some of the subscale groupings of items contained as few as 5 or 6 items, the internal consistency coefficients were still high (the lowest was for the last subscale that had only 5 items, and even then, Alpha was .90).

All in all, these results portray a certain degree of "halo effect" in the ratings. When teachers held positive attitudes about their pincipals, they tended to give similarly high ratings across many of the 78 survey items. There is also some degree of "reality" or "truth" embedded in this phenomenon as well, in the sense that principals do behave in a coordinated or concerted manner. For example, a principal who "always" appears to "demonstrate a commitment to academic goals" may very well also "always" seem to

"maintain high standards of student conduct". However, the extremely high internal consistency coefficients obtained (e.g., 0.99) suggest that the amount of consistency that was "reality-bound" was also enhanced by halo effects in teacher perceptions. The factor analysis findings to be reported next also illuminate this same issue.

Factor analysis is a method of extracting underlying dimensions from large numbers of measures that are interrelated. The current study of a 78 item questionnaire is a good example of when factor analytic work can be helpful. It has already been pointed out that the 78 survey items are not independent of each other. Therefore, it becomes very difficult (or more likely, impossible) to determine how to interpret a result for a particular item considered singly. If items A, B, and C are all intercorrelated at the .90 level, then we do not know the extent to which an observed result for item A was truly due to item A or was due to its covariance with items B and C. Factor analysis is a multivariate method which examines multiple variables <u>simultaneously</u>. In the above example, the factoring procedures would probably combine items A, B, and C into a single factor which would be independent of (i.e., uncorrelated with) other factors. Factors can also point to underlying dimensions that are not readily apparent in the content of the individual measures.

The teacher-level file was entered into factor analysis with <u>N</u> of 1294 and 78 items. There were 430 of the teachers who gave

valid responses to all 78 items. The factor methods employed principle axis extraction followed by varimax rotation. The extracted factors are orthogonal with respect to each other (i.e., they are not correlated). The current analysis of between-teacher variance on the 78 items yielded 8 factors.

The first factor extracted from the 78 items was very strong and relatively clear-cut. With 16 items loading $\geq$ .55 on this first factor, it accounted for 85.0% of the variance in the item intercorrelation matrix. In fact, 58 of the 78 items had loadings $\geq$ .30 on this factor. The factor has a major component related to the principal's affective leadership and success in interpersonal dealings with staff. This assertion is supported by the data in Appendix B that show that the items with the highest loadings (.6 to .8) deal with interpersonal matters: (the principal) "Is open and friendly", (the principal) "Treats staff with respect", (the principal) "Maintains a positive attitude", (the principal) "Welcomes new ideas", etc.). Other items loading on this factor represent concern about decision-making, management of conflict, delegation of authority, and evaluation of staff. The strong first factor exhibits the characteristics of teacher "halo effects" in ratings that were discussed earlier.

The factors extracted after the first one are much less strong in terms of the percentage of total variance accounted for, although this fact does not necessarily imply that they are trivial. Deter-

mination of the usefulness of the factors will be based on judgment of the conceptual or substantive nature of the items with the highest loadings. Factor 2 in the teacher-level analyses is largely a measure of the principal as an effective administrator. Principals with high scores on this factor are effective managers of supplies, time, and paperwork. They also are highly rated on selection of qualified personnel. This factor accounted for 3.4% of the total variance (more than one-fifth of the variance remaining after Factor 1 was extracted) and had 11 items with factor loadings $\geq$ .50.

Factor 3 accounted for 3.2% of the total variance and includes 9 items that have loadings $\geq$ .50. The nature of this factor seems to represent teacher perceptions of the principal's leadership in academics; the emphasis on instructional aspects of the schooling process. Another strong component of this factor deals with discipline, student conduct, and school climate. For example, highly loading items included: (the principal) "Has a high level of expectations for students' academic performance", (the principal) "Demonstrates a commitment to academic goals", as well as items on discipline and behavior management -- (the principal) "Maintains high standards of student conduct", (the principal) "Creates an atmosphere of order and discipline school-wide", etc. It is interesting that this one factor contained items reflecting discipline concerns and academic concerns. It seems that OCPS teachers perceive the interrelated nature of discipline and

academics; this perception is supported by literature on the relations between behavior management strategies, student "time-on-task", and student achievement.

Factor 4 accounted for 2.4% of the total item intercorrelation variance. This factor had five item responses with loadings $\geq$ .40. Those highest-loading items reflect the degree to which the principal is viewed as an active, aware monitor of instruction in the school. Principals with high ratings on this factor are seen in the halls frequently and regularly visit in classrooms.

Factor 5 had eight item responses with loadings $\geq$ .40 and accounted for 1.8% of the item intercorrelation variance. Most of the items were concerned with the involvement of others (such as staff and community) in school affairs, or dealt with support and communication with parents, central office, and the community. Two of the higher loading items don't fit the above pattern -- one that refers to teacher evaluation and one that reflects the use of achievement as an index of effectiveness.

Factor 6 in the between-teacher factor analysis had 7 survey responses with loadings $\geq$ .40 and accounted for 1.4% of the total variance. Most of the higher-loading items on this factor represent the degree to which the principal is a student-oriented administrator -- e.g., (the principal) "Promotes school sponsored activities", (the principal) "Affords students due process rights", and (the principal) "Uses positive rather than negative reinforcement with students".

Factor 7 accounted for 1.4% of the total variance and shows 4 items with loadings $\geq$ .30. Three of the four items with the highest loadings on this factor represent the teachers' view of the extent to which the principal complies with district, state, or federal regulations and policies. High scores on this factor represent high compliance with regulations.

Factor 8 had six items with loadings $\geq$ .30 and accounted for 1.3% of the variance. This was the last factor extracted in the analyses with the teacher as the unit of analysis. The two highest loading items concern the involvement of staff in inservice activities. Other items reflect involvement of staff in budgetary and instructional policy. On the surface, this factor might appear to resemble factor 5, which also had some "involvement" items. However, only one item loaded $\geq$ .4 on both factors. Factor 5 is focused on the involvement of the community and the support of central office and parents, while factor 8 primarily concerns the involvement of staff in inservice activities and instructional policy.

Since teachers were not identified, we cannot correlate teacher-level factors on perceptions of their principal with their class mean achievement gains. Analyses in the Kimball, et al. (1984) and the Crawford, et al. (1984) papers describe school-level analyses where such correlational analyses are possible.

Discussion

In the beginning, the study was initiated as a descriptive survey to tap teacher attitudes regarding principal leadership and school climate. This was accomplished by sending the 82 item questionnaire to all of the teachers in the district. Nearly 1300 were returned, an average of about 14 per school. One of the primary purposes of the project was to give feedback to principals -- to let them know how they were perceived by their teaching staff in areas related to principal effectiveness. This was accomplished by returning to the principals their own mean rating on each item, along with a "comparison" mean that represented the average rating for each item for their organizational level (elementary, fifth year, middle school, high school, and special centers). Indications were that the principals attended to this feedback.

In addition to giving principals descriptive feedback, the teacher-level data were entered into factor analyses so as to allow the extraction of underlying dimensions of teacher perceptions of their principals and of school climate. The factor structure of the survey items indicated one very strong factor, primarily affective in nature. The highest loading items were: (the principal) "treats staff with respect" and "is open and friendly." The strength of this factor (85% of the variance in the inter-correlation matrix) and the high degree of internal consistency both indicate the pervasive nature of the teachers' perceptions of

the principal's affective skills. Other factors were concerned with the principal's administrative or managerial style, monitoring of instruction and disciplinary matters, concern about students, and attention to regulations and policy. Individual item means were generally high, suggesting favorable attitudes toward principals as a rule. However, there was non-trivial variance on items and on factors -- variance among schools and among organizational grade-levels.

The teacher survey data also showed a very high degree of internal consistency reliability. That is, the 82 items were intercorrelated with each other. We interpret this as reflecting some degree of "halo effects" in the ratings as well as some degree of truth or reality. Principals who were given high ratings on some of the items also tended to have relatively high ratings on other items. All indications were that teachers did not capriciously respond to survey items -- the data were reliable and valid.

REFERENCES

Blumberg, Arthur and Greenfield, William D. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

Crawford, J., Kimball, G., and Watson, P. Causal Modeling of School Effects on Achievement. Chicago: AERA Meeting, 1985.

Foskett, J.M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal, Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.

Gross, N. and Herriot, R.E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Hemphill, J.K.; Griffiths, D.E.; and Frederikson, N. Administrative Performance and Personality, New York, Teachers College Press, 1962.

Kimball, G., Crawford, J., and Watson, P. Relations of Within-School Cohesiveness and Principal Ratings with Achievement. Chicago: AERA Meeting, 1985.

Lipham, J.M. and Francke, D.C. Non-Verbal Behavior of Administrators, Educational Administration Quarterly 2 (Spring 1966): 101-09.

Salley, C.; McPherson, R.B.; and Baehr, M.E. "What Principals Do: A Preliminary Occupational Analysis". In the Principal in Metropolitan Schools, edited by D.A. Erickson and T.L. Reller. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.

Sanders, J., Shively, J., and Machesney, D. School Effectiveness: Profile of School Excellance, New Orleans: AERA Meeting, 1984.

Yukl, G. Leadership in Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Appendix A: Leadership/Climate Inventory

Oklahoma City Public Schools
900 North Klein
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

TO: ALL TEACHERS & COUNSELORS

DATE: FEBRUARY 24, 1984

SUBJECT: LEADERSHIP/CLIMATE INVENTORY

In the fall of this school year our School Board approved a Discipline Committee to make recommendations for improving discipline in our schools. One the of many recommendations coming from the committee was that a School Climate Survey be conducted at each school. Such a survey will allow you to give your assessment of the leadership of your school. The inventory is attached.

Please note the instructions and return the completed survey form to: Planning, Research and Evaluation Department by March 16, 1984. Your responses are anonymous (do not put your name on the form). We ask that each teacher return the survey to Research (do not collect and send in bulk).

The data will be tabulated and returned to the building administrator. It is our hope that the principal will use the results as a part of his/her planning for the next school year.

If you have questions concerning the inventory, please be in touch with me, your director or Pat Watson in Research.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Betty G. Mason

Betty G. Mason

BGM:jr
attachment

February 21, 1984

Instructions:

Please write the name of your school. However, do not sign your name on the form; it is to be filled out anonymously.

Check one answer choice for each item.

Return the completed form to the Research Department via school mail. The form is self-addressed. Fold and tape.

Please have this form in the school mail no later than March 16,1984. (If you prefer you may send by U.S. Mail.)

NAME OF SCHOOL _____

LEADERSHIP/CLIMATE INVENTORY

(Teacher Form)

A. High Expectations

The Principal:

	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
1. Promotes school sponsored activities					
2. Demonstrates a commitment to academic goals					
3. Has a high level of expectations for students' academic performance					
4. Promotes events held to recognize student achievement					
5. Has realistic expectations of teachers					
6. Maintains high standards of student conduct					
7. Complies with regulations and policies: a) District					
b) State/Federal					
8. Clearly communicates what is expected of teachers					
9. Sees all students as capable of learning regardless of race or social class					
10. Affords students due process rights					
11. Assures the safety and welfare of: a) Students					
b) Staff					
12. Exhibits professional ethics					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. Instructional Leader

The Principal:	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
13. Uses positive rather than negative reinforcement with students					
14. Involves staff in developing in-service activities to meet: a) Organizational needs					
b) Individual needs					
15. Recognizes effective educational practices					
16. Provides instructional leadership within the school					
17. Maintains climate that is conducive to learning					
18. Directly involves teachers in instructional policy					
19. Is a good spokesperson for staff's interests and needs					
20. Is responsive to new instructional ideas					
21. Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of various ethnic groups					
22. Facilitates the instructional success of teachers					

C. Forceful/Dynamic

The Principal:	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
23. Anticipates and adapts to rapidly changing human, social, and environmental conditions					
24. Exercises discretion in making action plans and decisions					
25. Uses effective managerial practices					
26. Manages conflict and ambiguity successfully					
27. Orients newly assigned staff effectively					

C. Forceful/Dynamic, Continued

	A	U	H	S	N
28. Provides adequate supervision of: a) Teachers					
b) Counselors (Leave blank if not applicable)					
c) Clerical					
d) Assistant Principal (Leave blank if not applicable)					
29. Delegates authority appropriately					
30. Welcomes new ideas					
31. Maintains a positive attitude					

D. Consulting Others Effectively

The Principal:

	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
32. Consults and make intentions clear					
33. Works on a face-to-face basis with individual staff members					
34. Has the support of the staff					
35. Maintains effective communications with: a) Parents					
b) Teachers					
c) Students					
d) Local Community Groups					
36. Emphasizes cooperation among departments					
37. Treats staff with respect					
38. Could be called an "authoritative democratic" leader					
39. Is open and friendly					
40. Makes teachers proud to be part of this school staff					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

E. Creating Order/Discipline

The Principal:	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
41. Creates an atmosphere of order and discipline school-wide					
42. Supports teacher's efforts to maintain discipline					
43. Minimizes factors that disrupt the learning process					
44. Has rules that are few and simple					
45. Implements district policy and regulations (policy manual) by the book					
46. Plans ahead					
47. Effectively maintains records and other paperwork					

F. Resources

The Principal:	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
48. Coordinates resources to maintain an attractive school building					
49. Has the support of the school and business community					
50. Has the support of the Central Office					
51. Has the support of parents					
52. Provides staff with necessary materials and equipment					
53. Manages the building budget effectively					
54. Secures school property, equipment and supplies effectively					
55. Makes logical room assignments					
56. In the budget process, involves: a) Staff					
b) Community					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

F. Resources, Continued

	A	U	H	S	N
57. Selects qualified: a) Teachers					
b) Clerical staff					
c) Counselors (Leave blank if not applicable)					
d) Assistant Principal (Leave blank if not applicable)					
e) Other support staff					

G. Using Time Well

The Principal:

	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
58. Manages well the demands that compete for the principal's time and attention					
59. Is seen in the halls on a regular basis					
60. Spends a majority (90%) of the school day and week in the school building					
61. Gets out of the office into the building a majority (70%) of the school day					
62. Regularly visits and observes in my classroom with a specific purpose in mind					
63. Holds productive staff meetings					

H. Evaluating Results

The Principal:

	Always	Usually	Half the Time	Seldom	Never
	Check One				
64. Gives frequent feedback on evaluation (formal and informal) of teacher performance					
65. Uses pupil achievement as a basis of school/teacher effectiveness					
66. Directs complaints to the person responsible, not entire faculty					
67. Reprimands individually, privately, not in front of others					
68. Evaluates staff in such a way as to motivate them to perform better					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- - - -

Appendix B: Internal Consistency Reliability and Factor Analyses with the Teacher as the Unit of Analysis

Internal Consistency Assessment with Cronbach's Alpha

Total Scale

78 items
Alpha = .99179
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .584 to .899

"High Expectations" items

14 items
Alpha = .94885
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .630 to .812

"Instructional Leader" items

11 items
Alpha = .96254
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .664 to .894

"Forceful/Dynamic" items

10 items
Alpha = .96297
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .737 to .883

"Counsulting Other Effectively" items

12 items
Alpha = .97217
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .779 to .928

"Creating Order/Discipline" items

7 items
Alpha = .93489
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .729 to .867

Internal Consistency, continued:

"Resources" items

13 items
Alpha = .95041
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .649 to .835

"Using Time Well" items

6 items
Alpha = .92794
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .761 to .847

"Evaluation Results" items

5 items
Alpha = .89562
Range of corrected item with
total correlation: .629 to .826

Perceptions of the Principal's Interpersonal, Affective Skills

Items Loading ≥ .55

	Item	Factor Loadings
12.	Exhibits professional ethics	.553
19.	Is a good spokesperson for the staff's interests and needs	.604
24.	Exercises discretion in making action plans and decisions	.583
26.	Manages conflict and ambiguity successfully	.562
29.	Delegates authority appropriately	.594
30.	Welcomes new ideas	.629
31.	Maintains a positive attitude	.661
33.	Works on a face-to-face basis with individual staff members	.629
35.	Maintains effective communications with: b) Teachers	.638
36.	Emphasizes cooperation among departments	.549
37.	Treats staff with respect	.767
38.	Could be called an "authoritative democratic" leader	.557
39.	Is open and friendly	.741
40.	Makes teachers proud to be part of this school staff	.674
67.	Reprimands individually, privately, not in front of others	.582
68.	Evaluates staff in such a way as to motivate them to perform better	.593

Administrative Skills of the Principal
(Regarding Supplies, Property, Paperwork and Personnel)

Items Loading $\geq$ .5

	Item	Factor Loadings
28.	Provides adequate supervision of:	
	c) Clerical	.531
46.	Plans ahead	.521
47.	Effectively maintains records and other paperwork	.601
48.	Coordinates resources to maintain an attractive school building	.505
52.	Provides staff with necessary materials and equipment	.523
53.	Manages the building budget effectively	.549
54.	Secures school property, equipment and supplies effectively	.673
55.	Makes logical room assignments	.523
57.	Selects qualified:	
	a) Teachers	.592
	b) Clerical	.593
	e) Other support staff	.536

Principal Leadership in Academic and Disciplinary Matters

Items Loading ≥ .5

	Item	Factor Loadings
2.	Demonstrates a commitment to academic goals	.637
3.	Has a high level of expectations for students academic performance	.660
6.	Maintains high standards of student conduct	.665
11.	Assures the safety and welfare of: b) Teachers	.575
16.	Provides instructional leadership within the school	.511
17.	Maintains climate that is conducive to learning	.625
41.	Creates an atmosphere of order and discipline school-wide	.630
42.	Supports teachers efforts to maintain discipline	.541
43.	Minimizes factors that disrupt the learning process	.528

The Principal as an Active, Aware Monitor of School Activities

Items Loading $\geq$ .4

	Item	Factor Loadings
59.	Is seen in the halls on a regular basis	.707
60.	Spends a majority (90%) of the school day and week in the school building	.623
61.	Gets out of the office into the building a majority (70%) of the school day	.675
62.	Regularly visits and observes in my classroom with a specific purpose in mind	.515
63.	Holds productive staff meetings	.401

Involvement of Significant Others in Decision-Making (Through Communication)

Items Loading $\geq$ .4

	Item	Factor Loadings
35.	Maintains effective communications with local d) Community	.401
50.	Has the support of the central office	.428
51.	Has the support of parents	.422
56.	In the budget process, involves: a) Staff b) Community	.453 .587
62.	Regularly visits and observes in my classroom with a specific purpose in mind	.407
64.	Gives frequent feedback on evaluation (formal and informal) of teacher performance	.470
65.	Uses pupil achievement as a basis of school/teacher effectiveness	.427

The Principal as a Student-Oriented Administrator

Items Loading $\geq$ .4

	Item	Factor Loadings
1.	Promotes school sponsored activities	.571
4.	Promotes events held to recognize student achievements	.528
9.	Sees all students as capable of learning regardless of race or social class	.414
10.	Affords students due process rights	.556
11.	Assures the safety and welfare of: a) Students	.401
13.	Uses positive rather than negative reinforcement with students	.459
35.	Maintains effective communications with local: d) Community Groups	.419

The Principal's Degree of Compliance With Regulations and Policy

Items Loading $\geq$ .3

	Item	Factor Loadings
7.	Complies with regulations and policies:	
	a) District	.731
	b) State/Federal	.693
9.	See all students as capable of learning regardless of race or social class	.334
45.	Implements district policy and regulations (policy manual) by the book	.492

Involvement of Staff in Inservice Activities, in Instructional Policy and in the Budget Process

Items Loading $\geq$ .3

	Item	Factor Loadings
14.	Involves staff in developing inservice activities to meet:	
	a) Organizational Needs	.577
	b) Individual Needs	.539
15.	Recognizes effective educational practices	.305
18.	Directly involves teachers in instructional policy	.368
53.	Manages the building budget effectively	.375
56.	In the budget process, involves:	
	a) Staff	.423